COLORING CURVES THAT CROSS A FIXED CURVE

ALEXANDRE ROK[1] AND BARTOSZ WALCZAK[2]

Abstract. We prove that for every integer $t \geqslant 1$, the class of intersection graphs of curves in the plane each of which crosses a fixed curve in at least one and at most t points is χ-bounded. As a corollary, we prove that for any integers $k \geqslant 2$ and $t \geqslant 1$, every k-quasi-planar topological graph on n vertices with any two edges crossing at most t times has $O_{k,t}(n \log n)$ edges.

arXiv:1512.06112v3 [math.CO] 4 Aug 2016

1. Introduction

Overview. A *curve* is a homeomorphic image of the real interval $[0, 1]$ in the plane. The *intersection graph* of a family of curves has these curves as vertices and the intersecting pairs of curves as edges. Combinatorial and algorithmic aspects of intersection graphs of curves, also known as *string graphs*, have been attracting researchers for decades. A significant part of this research has been devoted to understanding classes of string graphs that are *χ-bounded*, which means that every graph G in the class satisfies $\chi(G) \leqslant f(\omega(G))$ for some function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, where $\chi(G)$ and $\omega(G)$ denote the chromatic number and the clique number (the maximum size of a clique) of G, respectively. Only recently, Pawlik et al. [24, 25] proved that the class of all string graphs is not χ-bounded. However, all known constructions of string graphs with small clique number and large chromatic number require a lot of freedom in placing curves around in the plane.

What restrictions on placement of curves lead to χ-bounded classes of intersection graphs? McGuinness [19, 20] proposed studying families of curves that cross a fixed curve *exactly once*. This initiated a series of results culminating in the proof that the class of intersection graphs of such families is indeed χ-bounded [26]. By contrast, the class of intersection graphs of curves each crossing a fixed curve *at least once* is equal to the class of all string graphs and therefore is not χ-bounded. We prove an essentially farthest possible generalization of the former result, allowing curves to cross the fixed curve *at least once and at most t times*, for any bound t.

Theorem 1. *For every integer $t \geqslant 1$ and any fixed curve c_0, the class of intersection graphs of curves each crossing c_0 in at least one and at most t points is χ-bounded.*

Additional motivation for Theorem 1 comes from its application to bounding the number of edges in so-called k-quasi-planar graphs, which we discuss at the end of this introduction.

Context. Chromatic number of intersection graphs of geometric objects has been investigated since the 1960s. In a seminal paper, Asplund and Grünbaum [3] proved that intersection graphs of axis-parallel rectangles in the plane satisfy $\chi = O(\omega^2)$ and conjectured that for every integer $d \geqslant 1$, there is a function $f_d\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that intersection graphs of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy $\chi \leqslant f_d(\omega)$. However, a few years later, a surprising construction due to Burling [5] showed that there are triangle-free intersection graphs of axis-parallel boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with arbitrarily large chromatic number. Since then, the upper bound of $O(\omega^2)$ and the trivial lower bound of $\Omega(\omega)$ on the maximum possible chromatic number of a rectangle intersection graph have been improved only in terms of multiplicative constants [11, 13].

Another classical example of a χ-bounded class of geometric intersection graphs is provided by circle graphs—intersection graphs of chords of a fixed circle. Gyárfás [10] proved that circle

[1] Department of Mathematics, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Be'er Sheva 84105, Israel, rok@math.bgu.ac.il.
[2] Department of Theoretical Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland, walczak@tcs.uj.edu.pl.
Alexandre Rok was partially supported by Israel Science Foundation grant 1136/12.
Bartosz Walczak was partially supported by National Science Center of Poland grant 2015/17/D/ST1/00585.

graphs satisfy $\chi = O(\omega^2 4^\omega)$. The best known upper and lower bounds on the maximum possible chromatic number of a circle graph are $O(2^\omega)$ [14] and $\Omega(\omega \log \omega)$ [12].

McGuinness [19, 20] proposed investigating the problem when much more general geometric shapes are allowed but the way how they are arranged in the plane is restricted. In [19], he proved that the class of intersection graphs of L-shapes crossing a fixed horizontal line is χ-bounded. Families of L-shapes in the plane are *simple*, which means that any two members of the family intersect in at most one point. McGuinness [20] also showed that triangle-free intersection graphs of simple families of curves each crossing a fixed line in exactly one point have bounded chromatic number. Further progress in this direction was made by Suk [27], who proved that simple families of x-monotone curves crossing a fixed vertical line give rise to a χ-bounded class of intersection graphs, and by Lasoń et al. [17], who reached the same conclusion without assuming that the curves are x-monotone. Finally, in [26], we proved that the class of intersection graphs of curves each crossing a fixed line in exactly one point is χ-bounded. These results remain valid if the fixed straight line is replaced by a fixed curve [28].

The class of string graphs is not χ-bounded. Pawlik et al. [24, 25] presented a construction of triangle-free intersection graphs of segments (or geometric shapes of various other kinds) with chromatic number growing as fast as $\Theta(\log \log n)$ with the number of vertices n. It was further generalized to a construction of string graphs with clique number ω and chromatic number $\Theta_\omega((\log \log n)^{\omega-1})$ [16]. The best known upper bound on the chromatic number of string graphs in terms of the number of vertices is $(\log n)^{O(\log \omega)}$, proved by Fox and Pach [8] using a separator theorem for string graphs due to Matoušek [18]. For intersection graphs of segments or, more generally, x-monotone curves, an upper bound of the form $\chi = O_\omega(\log n)$ follows from the above-mentioned result in [27] or [26] via recursive halving by vertical lines. Upper bounds of the form $\chi = O_\omega((\log \log n)^{f(\omega)})$ are known for very special classes of string graphs: rectangle overlap graphs [15, 16] and subtree overlap graphs [16]. The former still allow the triangle-free construction with $\chi = \Theta(\log \log n)$ and the latter the construction with $\chi = \Theta_\omega((\log \log)^{\omega-1})$.

Quasi-planarity. A *topological graph* is a graph with a fixed curvilinear drawing in the plane. For $k \geqslant 2$, a *k-quasi-planar graph* is a topological graph with no k pairwise crossing edges. In particular, a 2-quasi-planar graph is just a planar graph. It is conjectured that k-quasi-planar graphs with n vertices have $O_k(n)$ edges [4, 23]. For $k = 2$, this asserts a well-known property of planar graphs. The conjecture is also verified for $k = 3$ [2, 22] and $k = 4$ [1], but it remains open for $k \geqslant 5$. Best known upper bounds on the number of edges in a k-quasi-planar graph are $n(\log n)^{O(\log k)}$ in general [7, 8], $O_k(n \log n)$ for the case of x-monotone edges [29], $O_k(n \log n)$ for the case that any two edges intersect in at most one point [28], and $2^{\alpha(n)^\nu} n \log n$ for the case that any two edges intersect in at most t points, where α is the inverse Ackermann function and ν depends on k and t [28]. We apply Theorem 1 to improve the last bound to $O_{k,t}(n \log n)$.

Theorem 2. *Every k-quasi-planar topological graph G on n vertices such that any two edges of G intersect in at most t points has at most $\mu_{k,t} n \log n$ edges, where $\mu_{k,t}$ depends only on k and t.*

The proof follows the same line as the proof in [28] for the case $t = 1$ (see Section 3).

2. Proof of Theorem 1

Setup. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of positive integers. Graph-theoretic terms applied to a family of curves $\mathcal{F}$ have the same meaning as applied to the intersection graph of $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, the *chromatic number* of $\mathcal{F}$, denoted by $\chi(\mathcal{F})$, is the minimum number of colors in a *proper coloring* of $\mathcal{F}$ (a coloring that distinguishes pairs of intersecting curves), and the *clique number* of $\mathcal{F}$, denoted by $\omega(\mathcal{F})$, is the maximum size of a *clique* in $\mathcal{F}$ (a set of pairwise intersecting curves in $\mathcal{F}$).

Theorem 1 (rephrased)**.** *For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a non-decreasing function $f_t\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for any fixed curve c_0, every family $\mathcal{F}$ of curves each intersecting c_0 in at least one and at most t points satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f_t(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.*

A point p is a *proper crossing* of curves c_1 and c_2 if c_1 passes from one side to the other side of c_2 in a sufficiently small neighborhood of p. From now on, without significant loss of generality, we make the following implicit assumption: any two distinct curves that we consider intersect in finitely many points, and each of their intersection points is a proper crossing, except that a curve c may have an endpoint on another curve if this is required by the definition of c.

Initial reduction. We start by reducing Theorem 1 to a somewhat simpler and more convenient setting. We fix a horizontal line in the plane and call it the *baseline*. The upper halfplane bounded by the baseline is denoted by H^+. A 1-*curve* is a curve in H^+ that has one endpoint on the baseline and does not intersect the baseline in any other point. Intersection graphs of 1-*curves* are known as *outerstring graphs* and form a χ-bounded class of graphs—this result, due to the authors, is the starting point of the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 3 ([26])**.** *There is a non-decreasing function $f_0\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that every family $\mathcal{F}$ of 1-curves satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f_0(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.*

An *even-curve* is a curve that has both endpoints above the baseline and intersects the baseline in at least two points (this is an even number, by the proper crossing assumption). For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, a $2t$-*curve* is an even-curve that intersects the baseline in exactly $2t$ points. The *basepoint* of a 1-curve s is the endpoint of s on the baseline. A *basepoint* of an even-curve c is an intersection point of c with the baseline. Every even-curve c determines two 1-curves—the two parts of c from an endpoint to the closest basepoint. They are called the 1-*curves of* c and denoted by $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ so that the basepoint of $L(c)$ lies to the left of the basepoint of $R(c)$ on the baseline (see Figure 1). A family $\mathcal{F}$ of even-curves is an LR-*family* if every intersection between two curves $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ is an intersection between $L(c_1)$ and $R(c_2)$ or between $L(c_2)$ and $R(c_1)$. The main effort in this paper goes to proving the following statement on LR-families of even-curves.

Theorem 4. *There is a non-decreasing function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that every LR-family $\mathcal{F}$ of even-curves satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.*

Note that Theorem 4 makes no assumption on the maximum number of intersection points of an even-curve with the baseline. We derive Theorem 1 from Theorem 4 in two steps, first proving the following lemma, and then showing that Theorem 1 is essentially a special case of it.

Lemma 5. *For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a non-decreasing function $f_t\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that every family $\mathcal{F}$ of $2t$-curves no two of which intersect on or below the baseline satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f_t(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.*

Proof of Lemma 5 from Theorem 4. The proof goes by induction on t. Let f_0 and f be the functions claimed by Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, respectively, and let $f_t(k) = f_{t-1}^2(k) f(k)$ for $t \geqslant 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We establish the base case for $t = 1$ and the induction step for $t \geqslant 2$ simultaneously. Namely, fix an integer $t \geqslant 1$, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be as in the statement of the lemma. For every $2t$-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$, enumerate the endpoints and basepoints of c as $p_0(c), \dots, p_{2t+1}(c)$ in their order along c so that $p_0(c)$ and $p_1(c)$ are the endpoints of $L(c)$ while $p_{2t}(c)$ and $p_{2t+1}(c)$ are the endpoints of $R(c)$. Build two families of curves $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ putting the part of c from $p_0(c)$ to $p_{2t-1}(c)$ to $\mathcal{F}_1$ and the part of c from $p_2(c)$ to $p_{2t+1}(c)$ to $\mathcal{F}_2$ for every $c \in \mathcal{F}$. If $t = 1$, then $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are families of 1-curves. If $t \geqslant 2$, then $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are equivalent to families of $2(t-1)$-curves, because the curve in $\mathcal{F}_1$ or $\mathcal{F}_2$ obtained from a $2t$-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$ can be shortened a little at $p_{2t-1}(c)$ or $p_2(c)$, respectively, losing that basepoint but no intersection points with other curves.

Therefore, by Theorem 3 or the induction hypothesis, we have $\chi(\mathcal{F}_k) \leqslant f_{t-1}(\omega(\mathcal{F}_k)) \leqslant f_{t-1}(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$ for $k \in \{1,2\}$. For $c \in \mathcal{F}$ and $k \in \{1,2\}$, let $\phi_k(c)$ be the color of the curve obtained from c in an optimal proper coloring of $\mathcal{F}_k$. Every subfamily of $\mathcal{F}$ on which ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are constant is an LR-family and therefore, by Theorem 4 and monotonicity of f, has chromatic number at most $f(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$. We conclude that $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant \chi(\mathcal{F}_1)\chi(\mathcal{F}_2)f(\omega(\mathcal{F})) \leqslant f_{t-1}^2(\omega(\mathcal{F}))f(\omega(\mathcal{F})) = f_t(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$. □

A *closed curve* is a homeomorphic image of a unit circle in the plane. For a closed curve γ, the Jordan curve theorem asserts that the set $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma$ consists of two connected components: one bounded, denoted by $\operatorname{int}\gamma$, and one unbounded, denoted by $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$.

Proof of Theorem 1 from Theorem 4. We elect to present this proof in an intuitive rather than rigorous way. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of curves each intersecting c_0 in at least one and at most t points. Let γ_0 be a closed curve surrounding c_0 very closely so that γ_0 intersects every curve in $\mathcal{F}$ in exactly $2t$ points (winding if necessary to increase the number of intersections) and all endpoints of curves in $\mathcal{F}$ and intersection points of pairs of curves in $\mathcal{F}$ lie in $\operatorname{ext}\gamma_0$. We "invert" $\operatorname{int}\gamma_0$ with $\operatorname{ext}\gamma_0$ to obtain an equivalent family of curves $\mathcal{F}'$ and a closed curve γ_0' with the same properties except that all endpoints of curves in $\mathcal{F}'$ and intersection points of pairs of curves in $\mathcal{F}'$ lie in $\operatorname{int}\gamma_0'$. It follows that some part of γ_0' lies in the unbounded component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{F}'$. We "cut" γ_0' there and "unfold" it into the baseline, transforming $\mathcal{F}'$ into an equivalent family $\mathcal{F}''$ of $2t$-curves all endpoints of which and intersection points of pairs of which lie above the baseline. The "equivalence" of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}'$, and $\mathcal{F}''$ means in particular that the intersection graphs of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}'$, and $\mathcal{F}''$ are isomorphic, so the theorem follows from Lemma 5 (and thus Theorem 4). □

In an LR-family of even-curves $\mathcal{F}$, only the 1-curves $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ of any curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$ participate in intersections with other curves in $\mathcal{F}$, and the part of c connecting $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ remains disjoint from all other curves in $\mathcal{F}$. It turns out that these "middle" parts connecting the two 1-curves of even-curves in $\mathcal{F}$ are essential for Theorem 4 to hold. To state this formally, we define a *double-curve* as a set $X \subseteq H^+$ that is a union of two disjoint 1-curves, denoted by $L(X)$ and $R(X)$ so that the basepoint of $L(X)$ lies to the left of the basepoint of $R(X)$, and we call a family $\mathcal{X}$ of double-curves an *LR-family* if every intersection between two double-curves $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ is an intersection between $L(X_1)$ and $R(X_2)$ or between $L(X_2)$ and $R(X_1)$.

Theorem 6. *There are triangle-free LR-families of double-curves $\mathcal{X}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{X})$ arbitrarily large.*

The proof of Theorem 6 is an easy adaptation of the construction from [24, 25]. We omit the details. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.

More notation and terminology. Let $\prec$ denote the left-to-right order of points on the baseline ($p_1 \prec p_2$ means that p_1 is to the left of p_2). For convenience, we also use the notation $\prec$ for curves intersecting the baseline ($c_1 \prec c_2$ means that every basepoint of c_1 is to the left of every basepoint of c_2) and for families of such curves ($\mathcal{C}_1 \prec \mathcal{C}_2$ means that $c_1 \prec c_2$ for any $c_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $c_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$). For a family $\mathcal{C}$ of curves intersecting the baseline (even-curves or 1-curves) and two 1-curves x and y, let $\mathcal{C}(x,y) = \{c \in \mathcal{C} \colon x \prec c \prec y\}$ or $\mathcal{C}(x,y) = \{c \in \mathcal{C} \colon y \prec c \prec x\}$ depending on whether $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$. For a family $\mathcal{C}$ of curves intersecting the baseline and a segment I on the baseline, let $\mathcal{C}(I)$ denote the family of curves in $\mathcal{C}$ with all basepoints on I.

For an even-curve c, let $M(c)$ denote the subcurve of c connecting the basepoints of $L(c)$ and $R(c)$, and let $I(c)$ denote the segment on the baseline connecting the basepoints of $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ (see Figure 1). For a family $\mathcal{F}$ of even-curves, let $L(\mathcal{F}) = \{L(c) \colon c \in \mathcal{F}\}$, $R(\mathcal{F}) = \{R(c) \colon c \in \mathcal{F}\}$, and $I(\mathcal{F})$ denote the minimal segment on the baseline that contains $I(c)$ for every $c \in \mathcal{F}$.

A *cap-curve* is a curve in H^+ that has both endpoints on the baseline and does not intersect the baseline in any other point. For a cap-curve γ, it follows from the Jordan curve theorem

that the set $H^+ \setminus \gamma$ consists of two connected components: one bounded, denoted by $\operatorname{int}\gamma$, and one unbounded, denoted by $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$. Any two cap-curves one with endpoints p_1, q_1 and the other with endpoints p_2, q_2 such that $p_1 \prec p_2 \prec q_1 \prec q_2$ intersect in an odd number of points.

Reduction to LR-families of 2-curves. We will reduce Theorem 4 to the following statement on LR-families of 2-curves, which is essentially a special case of Theorem 4.

Lemma 7. *There is a non-decreasing function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that every LR-family $\mathcal{F}$ of 2-curves satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.*

A *component* of a family of 1-curves $\mathcal{S}$ is a connected component of $\bigcup\mathcal{S}$ (the union of all curves in $\mathcal{S}$ in the plane). The following easy but powerful observation reuses an idea from [17, 20, 27].

Lemma 8. *For every LR-family of even-curves $\mathcal{F}$, if $\mathcal{F}^\star$ is the family of curves $c \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ lie in distinct components of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$, then $\chi(\mathcal{F}^\star) \leqslant 4$.*

Proof. Let G be an auxiliary graph the vertices of which are the components of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$ and the edges of which are the pairs V_1V_2 of components such that there is a curve $c \in \mathcal{F}^\star$ with $L(c) \subseteq V_1$ and $R(c) \subseteq V_2$ or $L(c) \subseteq V_2$ and $R(c) \subseteq V_1$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is an LR-family, the curves in $\mathcal{F}^\star$ cannot intersect "outside" the components of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$. It follows that G is planar and thus 4-colorable. Fix a proper 4-coloring of G, and assign the color of a component V to every curve $c \in \mathcal{F}^\star$ with $L(c) \subseteq V$. For any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{F}^\star$, if $L(c_1)$ and $R(c_2)$ intersect, then $L(c_1)$ and $R(c_2)$ lie in the same component V_1 while $L(c_2)$ lies in a component V_2 such that V_1V_2 is an edge of G, so c_1 and c_2 are assigned distinct colors. The coloring of $\mathcal{F}^\star$ is therefore proper. □

Proof of Theorem 4 from Lemma 7. We show that $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F})) + 4$, where f is the function claimed by Lemma 7. We have $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$, where $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}\colon L(c)$ and $R(c)$ lie in the same component of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}\colon L(c)$ and $R(c)$ lie in distinct components of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})\}$. Lemma 8 yields $\chi(\mathcal{F}_2) \leqslant 4$. It remains to show that $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1) \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$.

Let $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{F}_1$. We claim that the intervals $I(c_1)$ and $I(c_2)$ are nested or disjoint. Suppose they are not. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and a component V of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$, let V^ε denote the ε-neighborhood of V in H^+. We assume that ε is small enough so that the sets V^ε for all components V of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$ and the curves $M(c)$ for all $c \in \mathcal{F}_1$ are pairwise disjoint (except at common basepoints). For $k \in \{1, 2\}$, since $L(c_k)$ and $R(c_k)$ belong to the same component V_k of $L(\mathcal{F}) \cup R(\mathcal{F})$, there is a cap-curve $\gamma_k \subseteq V_k^\varepsilon$ that connects the basepoints of $L(c_k)$ and $R(c_k)$. We can assume without loss of generality that γ_1 and γ_2 intersect in a finite number of points and each of their intersection points is a proper crossing (this is why we take $\gamma_k \subseteq V_k^\varepsilon$ instead of $\gamma_k \subseteq V_k$). Since $I(c_1)$ and $I(c_2)$ are neither nested nor disjoint, the basepoints of $L(c_2)$ and $R(c_2)$ lie one in $\operatorname{int}\gamma_1$ and the other in $\operatorname{ext}\gamma_1$, so γ_1 and γ_2 intersect in an odd number of points. For $k \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ be the closed curve obtained as the union of γ_k and $M(c_k)$. It follows that $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_2$ intersect in an odd number of points and each of their intersection points is a proper crossing, which is a contradiction.

Transform $\mathcal{F}_1$ into a family of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}_1'$ replacing the part $M(c)$ of every curve $c \in \mathcal{F}_1$ by the lower semicircle connecting the endpoints of $M(c)$. These semicircles are pairwise disjoint (because $I(c_1)$ and $I(c_2)$ are nested or disjoint for any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{F}_1$), so $\mathcal{F}_1'$ is an LR-family with intersection graph isomorphic to that of $\mathcal{F}_1$. Lemma 7 yields $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1) = \chi(\mathcal{F}_1') \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F}_1')) \leqslant f(\omega(\mathcal{F}))$. □

Reduction to ξ-families. For $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$, a *ξ-family* is an LR-family of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}$ with the following property: for every 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$, the family of 2-curves in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{c\}$ that intersect c has chromatic number at most ξ. We reduce Lemma 7 to the following statement on ξ-families.

Lemma 9. *For any $\xi, k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a constant $\zeta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant \zeta$.*

Proof of Lemma 7 from Lemma 9. Let $f(1) = 1$. For $k \geqslant 2$, let $f(k)$ be the constant claimed by Lemma 9 such that every $f(k-1)$-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(k)$. Let $k = \omega(\mathcal{F})$, and proceed by induction on k to prove $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(k)$. Clearly, if $k = 1$, then $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = 1$. For the induction step, assume $k \geqslant 2$. For every $c \in \mathcal{F}$, the family of 2-curves in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{c\}$ that intersect c has clique number at most $k-1$ and therefore, by the induction hypothesis, has chromatic number at most $f(k-1)$. That is, $\mathcal{F}$ is an $f(k-1)$-family, and the definition of f yields $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(k)$. □

Dealing with ξ-families. First, we establish the following special case of Lemma 9.

Lemma 10. *For every $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$, every ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\bigcap_{c\in\mathcal{F}} I(c) \neq \emptyset$ satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant 4\xi + 4$.*

The proof of Lemma 10 is essentially the same as the proof of Lemma 19 in [28]. We need the following elementary lemma, which was also used in various forms in [17, 19, 20, 26, 27].

Lemma 11 (McGuinness [19, Lemma 2.1])**.** *Let G be a graph, $\prec$ be a total order on the vertices of G, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\chi(G) > (2\beta + 2)\alpha$, then G has an induced subgraph H such that $\chi(H) > \alpha$ and $\chi(G(u, v)) > \beta$ for every edge uv of H. In particular, if $\chi(G) > 2\beta + 2$, then G has an edge uv with $\chi(G(u, v)) > \beta$. Here, $G(u, v)$ denotes the subgraph of G induced on the vertices strictly between u and v in the order $\prec$.*

Proof of Lemma 10. Suppose $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > 4\xi + 4$. Since $\bigcap_{c\in\mathcal{F}} I(c) \neq \emptyset$, the 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$ can be enumerated as $c_1, \ldots, c_{|\mathcal{F}|}$ so that $L(c_1) \prec \cdots \prec L(c_{|\mathcal{F}|}) \prec R(c_{|\mathcal{F}|}) \prec \cdots \prec R(c_1)$. Apply Lemma 11 to the intersection graph of $\mathcal{F}$ and the order $c_1, \ldots, c_{|\mathcal{F}|}$ to obtain two indices $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{F}|\}$ such that the 2-curves c_i and c_j intersect and $\chi(\{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_{j-1}\}) > 2\xi + 1$. Assume $L(c_i)$ and $R(c_j)$ intersect; the argument for the other case is analogous. There is a cap-curve $\gamma \subseteq L(c_i) \cup R(c_j)$ connecting the basepoints of $L(c_i)$ and $R(c_j)$. Every curve intersecting γ intersects c_i or c_j. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family, the 2-curves in $\{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_{j-1}\}$ that intersect c_i have chromatic number at most ξ, and so do those that intersect c_j. Every 2-curve $c_k \in \{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_{j-1}\}$ not intersecting γ satisfies $L(c_k) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$ and $R(c_k) \subseteq \operatorname{ext}\gamma$, so these 2-curves are pairwise disjoint. We conclude that $\chi(\{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_{j-1}\}) \leqslant 2\xi + 1$, which is a contradiction. □

It easily follows from Lemma 11 that every family of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > (2\beta+2)^2\alpha$ contains a subfamily $\mathcal{H}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > \alpha$ such that $\chi(\mathcal{F}(L(c_1), L(c_2))) > \beta$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}(R(c_1), R(c_2))) > \beta$ for any two intersecting 2-curves $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. This is considerably strengthened by the following lemma. Its proof builds on the ideas present in the proof of Lemma 11. We omit the details.

Lemma 12. *For every $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ and every ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha, \beta)$, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > \alpha$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}(x, y)) > \beta$ for any two intersecting 1-curves $x \in R(\mathcal{H})$ and $y \in L(\mathcal{H})$.*

It is proved in [26] that for every family of 1-curves $\mathcal{S}$, there is a cap-curve γ and a subfamily $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{U}) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathcal{S})$ such that every 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}$ is contained in $\operatorname{int}\gamma$ and intersects some 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}$ that intersects $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$. The proof follows an idea from [10], used subsequently also in [17, 19, 20, 21, 27], defining $\mathcal{U}$ as one of the sets of 1-curves at a fixed distance from an appropriately chosen 1-curve in the intersection graph of $\mathcal{S}$. However, this method fails to imply an analogous statement for 2-curves. We will need a more powerful tool—part of the recent series on induced subgraphs that must be present in graphs with sufficiently large chromatic number.

Theorem 13 (Chudnovsky, Scott, Seymour [6, Theorem 1.7])**.** *There is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, every string graph G with $\chi(G) > f(\alpha)$ contains a vertex v such that $\chi(G^2_v) > \alpha$, where G^2_v denotes the subgraph of G induced on the vertices within distance at most 2 from v.*

The special case of Theorem 13 for triangle-free intersection graphs of curves any two of which intersect in at most one point was proved earlier by McGuinness [21, Theorem 5.3].

Lemma 14 (see Figure 2)**.** *For every $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and every ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha)$, there are a cap-curve γ and a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > \alpha$ such that every 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies $L(c), R(c) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$ and intersects some 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ that intersects $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$.*

Proof. Let $f(\alpha) = f_1(3\alpha + 5\xi + 5)$, where f_1 is the function claimed by Theorem 13. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a ξ-family with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha)$. It follows that there is a 2-curve $c^\star \in \mathcal{F}$ such that the family of curves within distance at most 2 from $c^\star$ in the intersection graph of $\mathcal{F}$ has chromatic number greater than $3\alpha + 5\xi + 5$. For $k \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathcal{F}_k$ be the 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$ at distance exactly k from $c^\star$ in the intersection graph of $\mathcal{F}$. Since $\chi(\{c^\star\} \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2) > 3\alpha + 5\xi + 5$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1) \leqslant \xi$ (because $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family), we have $\chi(\mathcal{F}_2) > 3\alpha + 4\xi + 4$. We have $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{G}_3 \cup \mathcal{G}_4$, where

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}_2 \colon L(c) \prec R(c) \prec L(c^\star) \prec R(c^\star)\}, \quad \mathcal{G}_2 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}_2 \colon L(c^\star) \prec L(c) \prec R(c) \prec R(c^\star)\},$$
$$\mathcal{G}_3 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}_2 \colon L(c^\star) \prec R(c^\star) \prec L(c) \prec R(c)\}, \quad \mathcal{G}_4 = \{c \in \mathcal{F}_2 \colon L(c) \prec L(c^\star) \prec R(c^\star) \prec R(c)\}.$$

Since $\chi(\mathcal{F}_2) > 3\alpha + 4\xi + 4$ and $\chi(\mathcal{G}_4) \leqslant 4\xi + 4$ (by Lemma 10), we have $\chi(\mathcal{G}_k) > \alpha$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since neither basepoint of the 2-curve $c^\star$ lies on $I(\mathcal{G}_k)$, there is a cap-curve γ with $L(c^\star), R(c^\star) \subseteq \operatorname{ext}\gamma$ and $L(c), R(c) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$ for every $c \in \mathcal{G}_k$. The lemma follows with $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_k$. □

Reduction to (ξ, h)-families. For $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$ and a function $h\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, a *$(\xi, h)$-family* is a ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with the following additional property: for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and every subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > h(\alpha)$, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > \alpha$ such that every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ with a basepoint on $I(\mathcal{H})$ has both basepoints on $I(\mathcal{G})$. We will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *For any $\xi, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any function $h\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there is a constant $\zeta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every (ξ, h)-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant \zeta$.*

The notion of a (ξ, h)-family and Lemma 15 provide a convenient abstraction of what is needed to prove the next lemma and then to prove Lemma 9 with the use of the next lemma.

Lemma 16. *For any $\xi, k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, every ξ-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha)$ contains a 2-curve c such that $\chi(\mathcal{F}(I(c))) > \alpha$.*

Proof of Lemma 16 from Lemma 15. Let $h_\alpha\colon \mathbb{N} \ni \beta \mapsto \beta + 2\alpha + 2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $f(\alpha)$ be the constant claimed by Lemma 15 such that every (ξ, h_α)-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ satisfies $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant f(\alpha)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a ξ-family with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}(I(c))) \leqslant \alpha$ for every $c \in \mathcal{F}$. It is enough to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is a (ξ, h_α)-family. To this end, consider a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > h_\alpha(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. Take $\mathcal{G}_L, \mathcal{G}_R \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ so that $L(\mathcal{G}_L) \prec L(\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_L)$, $\chi(\mathcal{G}_L) = \alpha + 1$, $R(\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_R) \prec R(\mathcal{G}_R)$, and $\chi(\mathcal{G}_R) = \alpha + 1$. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \setminus (\mathcal{G}_L \cup \mathcal{G}_R)$. It follows that $\chi(\mathcal{H}) \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{G}) - 2\alpha - 2 > \beta$. If there is a 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$ with one basepoint on $I(\mathcal{H})$ and the other basepoint not on $I(\mathcal{G})$, then $\mathcal{G}_L \subseteq \mathcal{F}(I(c))$ or $\mathcal{G}_R \subseteq \mathcal{F}(I(c))$, so $\chi(\mathcal{F}(I(c))) \geqslant \alpha + 1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ with a basepoint on $I(\mathcal{H})$ has both basepoints on $I(\mathcal{G})$. This shows that $\mathcal{F}$ is a (ξ, h_α)-family. □

Proof of Lemma 9 from Lemma 15. Let h be the function claimed by Lemma 16 for ξ and k. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a ξ-family with $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k$. In view of Lemma 15, it is enough to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is a (ξ, h)-family. To this end, consider a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > h(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 16 yields a 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\chi(\mathcal{G}(I(c))) > \alpha$. Every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ with a basepoint on $I(c)$ has both basepoints on $I(c)$, otherwise it would cross c below the baseline. Therefore, the condition of a (ξ, h)-family is satisfied with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}(I(c))$. □

Dealing with (ξ, h)-families. The rest of the proof is inspired from the ideas in [26].

A family of 1-curves $\mathcal{S}$ *supports* a family of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}$ if every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ intersects some 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}$. A *skeleton* is a pair $(\gamma, \mathcal{U})$ such that γ is a cap-curve and $\mathcal{U}$ is a family of pairwise disjoint 1-curves each of which has one endpoint (other than the basepoint) on γ and all the remaining part in $\operatorname{int}\gamma$ (see Figure 3). For a family of 1-curves $\mathcal{S}$, a skeleton $(\gamma, \mathcal{U})$ is an *$\mathcal{S}$-skeleton* if every 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}$ is a subcurve of some 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}$. A skeleton $(\gamma, \mathcal{U})$ *supports* a family of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}$ if every 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $L(c), R(c) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$ and intersects some 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}$.

Lemma 17. *For every function $h\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$, every (ξ, h)-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha, \beta)$ contains one of the following structures:*

- *a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > \alpha$ supported by an $L(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton or an $R(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton,*
- *a subfamily $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > \beta$ supported by a family of 1-curves $\mathcal{S} \subseteq L(\mathcal{F})$ or $\mathcal{S} \subseteq R(\mathcal{F})$ such that $s \prec \mathcal{H}$ or $\mathcal{H} \prec s$ for every 1-curve $s \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Let $f(\alpha, \beta) = f_1(2\alpha + h(2\beta) + 4)$, where f_1 is the function claimed by Lemma 14. Apply Lemma 14 to obtain a cap-curve γ and a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > 2\alpha + h(2\beta) + 4$ such that every 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies $L(c), R(c) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$ and intersects some 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$. Here and further on, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ denotes the family of 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$ that intersect $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$. Let $\mathcal{U}_L$ be the 1-curves that are subcurves of 1-curves in $L(\mathcal{F})$, have one endpoint (other than the basepoint) on γ, and have all the remaining part in $\operatorname{int}\gamma$. Let $\mathcal{U}_R$ be the 1-curves that are subcurves of 1-curves in $R(\mathcal{F})$, have one endpoint (other than the basepoint) on γ, and have all the remaining part in $\operatorname{int}\gamma$. Thus $(\gamma, \mathcal{U}_L)$ is an $L(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton, and $(\gamma, \mathcal{U}_R)$ is an $R(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton. Let $\mathcal{G}_L$ be the 2-curves in $\mathcal{G}$ that intersect some 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_L$, and let $\mathcal{G}_R$ be those that intersect some 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_R$. If $\chi(\mathcal{G}_L) > \alpha$ or $\chi(\mathcal{G}_R) > \alpha$, then the first conclusion of the lemma holds. Thus assume $\chi(\mathcal{G}_L) \leqslant \alpha$ and $\chi(\mathcal{G}_R) \leqslant \alpha$. Let $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G} \setminus (\mathcal{G}_L \cup \mathcal{G}_R)$. It follows that $\chi(\mathcal{G}') \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{G}) - 2\alpha > h(2\beta) + 4$.

By Lemma 8, the 2-curves $c \in \mathcal{G}'$ such that $L(c)$ and $R(c)$ lie in distinct components of $L(\mathcal{G}') \cup R(\mathcal{G}')$ have chromatic number at most 4. Therefore, there is a component V of $L(\mathcal{G}') \cup R(\mathcal{G}')$ such that $\chi(\mathcal{G}'_V) \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{G}') - 4 > h(2\beta)$, where $\mathcal{G}'_V = \{c \in \mathcal{G}' \colon L(c), R(c) \subseteq V\}$. There is a cap-curve $\nu \subseteq V$ connecting the two endpoints of the segment $I(\mathcal{G}'_V)$. Suppose there is a 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ with both basepoints on $I(\mathcal{G}'_V)$. If $L(c)$ intersects $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$, then the part of $L(c)$ from the basepoint to the first intersection point with γ, which is a 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_L$, must intersect ν (as $\nu \subseteq V \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$) and thus a curve in $\mathcal{G}'$ (as V is a component of $\mathcal{G}'$). Thus $\mathcal{G}' \cap \mathcal{G}_L \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. An analogous contradiction is reached if $R(c)$ intersects $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$. This shows that no curve in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ has both basepoints on $I(\mathcal{G}'_V)$.

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a (ξ, h)-family and $\chi(\mathcal{G}'_V) > h(2\beta)$, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{H}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}'_V$ with $\chi(\mathcal{H}') > 2\beta$ such that every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}$ with a basepoint on $I(\mathcal{H}')$ has the other basepoint on $I(\mathcal{G}'_V)$. This and the above imply that no curve in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ has a basepoint on $I(\mathcal{H}')$. Since every curve in $\mathcal{H}'$ intersects some curve in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, we have $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}_L \cup \mathcal{H}_R$, where $\mathcal{H}_L$ are the 2-curves in $\mathcal{H}'$ that intersect some 1-curve in $L(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}})$ and $\mathcal{H}_R$ are those that intersect some 1-curve in $R(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}})$. Since $\chi(\mathcal{H}') > 2\beta$, we conclude that $\chi(\mathcal{H}_L) > \beta$ or $\chi(\mathcal{H}_R) > \beta$ and thus the second conclusion of the lemma holds with $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{H}_L, L(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}))$ or $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{H}_R, R(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{ext}}))$, respectively. □

Lemma 18. *For every function $h\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, every (ξ, h)-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(\alpha)$ contains a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > \alpha$ supported by an $L(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton or an $R(\mathcal{F})$-skeleton.*

Proof. Let $f(\alpha) = f_1(\alpha, f_1(\alpha, f_1(\alpha, 4\xi)))$, where f_1 is the function claimed by Lemma 17. Suppose to the contrary that no such subfamily $\mathcal{G}$ exists. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$. Apply Lemma 17 three times to obtain families $\mathcal{F}_1$, $\mathcal{F}_2$, $\mathcal{F}_3$, $\mathcal{S}_1$, $\mathcal{S}_2$, and $\mathcal{S}_3$ with the following properties:

- $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_3$,
- for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, we have $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq L(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$ or $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq R(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$, $\mathcal{F}_i$ is supported by $\mathcal{S}_i$, and $s \prec \mathcal{F}_i$ or $\mathcal{F}_i \prec s$ for every 1-curve $s \in \mathcal{S}_i$.
- $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1) > f_1(\alpha, f_1(\alpha, 4\xi))$, $\chi(\mathcal{F}_2) > f_1(\alpha, 4\xi)$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_3) > 4\xi$.

There are two indices $i, j \in \{1,2,3\}$ with $i < j$ such that $\mathcal{S}_i$ and $\mathcal{S}_j$ are of the same "type": either $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq L(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{S}_j \subseteq L(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$ or $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq R(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{S}_j \subseteq R(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$. Assume for the rest of the proof that $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq R(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{S}_j \subseteq R(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$; the argument for the other case is analogous.

Let $\mathcal{S}_\prec = \{s \in \mathcal{S}_j \colon s \prec \mathcal{F}_j\}$, $\mathcal{S}_\succ = \{s \in \mathcal{S}_j \colon \mathcal{F}_j \prec s\}$, $\mathcal{F}_\prec$ be the 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}_j$ that intersect some 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}_\prec$, and $\mathcal{F}_\succ$ be those that intersect some 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}_\succ$. Thus $\mathcal{F}_\prec \cup \mathcal{F}_\succ = \mathcal{F}_j$. This and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_j) \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{F}_3) > 4\xi$ yield $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec) > 2\xi$ or $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\succ) > 2\xi$. Assume for the rest of the proof that $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec) > 2\xi$; the argument for the other case is analogous.

Let $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$ be an inclusion-minimal subfamily of $\mathcal{S}_\prec$ with the property that $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$ still supports $\mathcal{F}_\prec$. Let $s^\star$ be the 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$ with rightmost basepoint, and let $\mathcal{F}_\prec^\star = \{c \in \mathcal{F}_\prec \colon L(c)$ intersects $s^\star\}$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family, we have $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec^\star) \leqslant \xi$. By the choice of $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$, there exists a 2-curve $c^\star \in \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star$ disjoint from every 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$ other than $s^\star$. Since $\mathcal{F}_\prec$ is supported by $\mathcal{S}_i$, there is a 1-curve $s_i \in \mathcal{S}_i$ that intersects $L(c^\star)$. We show that every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}_\prec \setminus \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star$ intersects s_i.

Let $c \in \mathcal{F}_\prec \setminus \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star$, and let s be a 1-curve in $\mathcal{S}_\prec^{\min}$ that intersects $L(c)$. Thus $s \neq s^\star$, by the definition of $\mathcal{F}_\prec^\star$. There is a cap-curve $\gamma \subseteq L(c) \cup s$. Since $s \prec s^\star \prec L(c)$ and $s^\star$ intersects neither s nor $L(c)$, we have $s^\star \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$. Since $L(c^\star)$ intersects $s^\star$ but neither s nor $L(c)$, we also have $L(c^\star) \subseteq \operatorname{int}\gamma$. Since $s_i \prec \mathcal{F}_i$ or $\mathcal{F}_i \prec s_i$, the basepoint of s_i lies in $\operatorname{ext}\gamma$. Therefore, since s_i intersects $L(c^\star)$, the 1-curve s_i must enter $\operatorname{int}\gamma$ through a point on $L(c)$. This shows that every 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}_\prec \setminus \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star$ intersects s_i. This and the assumption that $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family yield $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec \setminus \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star) \leqslant \xi$. We conclude that $\chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec) \leqslant \chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec^\star) + \chi(\mathcal{F}_\prec \setminus \mathcal{F}_\prec^\star) \leqslant 2\xi$, which is a contradiction. □

A *chain* of length n is a sequence $((a_1,b_1),\dots,(a_n,b_n))$ of pairs of 2-curves such that

- for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, the 1-curves $R(a_i)$ and $L(b_i)$ intersect,
- for $2 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, the basepoints of $R(a_i)$ and $L(b_i)$ lie between the basepoints of $R(a_{i-1})$ and $L(b_{i-1})$, and $L(a_i)$ intersects $R(a_1),\dots,R(a_{i-1})$ or $R(b_i)$ intersects $L(b_1),\dots,L(b_{i-1})$.

Lemma 19. *For every $\xi \in \mathbb{N}$ and every function $h\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every (ξ,h)-family $\mathcal{F}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(n)$ contains a chain of length n.*

Proof (see Figure 4). We define the function g by induction. Let $f(1) = 1$; if $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > 1$, then $\mathcal{F}$ contains two intersecting 2-curves, which form a chain of length 1. For the induction step, fix $n \geqslant 1$, and assume that every (ξ,h)-family $\mathcal{H}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > f(n)$ contains a chain of length n. Let

$$\beta = f_1\big(f(n), h(2\xi) + 4\xi + 2\big), \qquad f(n+1) = f_2(f_2(f_2(\beta))),$$

where f_1 is the function claimed by Lemma 12 and f_2 is the function claimed by Lemma 18. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a (ξ,h)-family with $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > f(n+1)$. We claim that $\mathcal{F}$ contains a chain of length $n+1$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$. Apply Lemma 18 three times to find families of 2-curves $\mathcal{F}_1$, $\mathcal{F}_2$, $\mathcal{F}_3$ and skeletons $(\gamma_1,\mathcal{U}_1)$, $(\gamma_2,\mathcal{U}_2)$, $(\gamma_3,\mathcal{U}_3)$ with the following properties:

- $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_3$,
- for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, $(\gamma_i,\mathcal{U}_i)$ is an $L(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$-skeleton or an $R(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$-skeleton supporting $\mathcal{F}_i$,
- $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1) > f_2(f_2(\beta))$, $\chi(\mathcal{F}_2) > f_2(\beta)$, and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_3) > \beta$.

There are two indices $i, j \in \{1,2,3\}$ with $i < j$ such that the skeletons $(\gamma_i,\mathcal{U}_i)$ and $(\gamma_j,\mathcal{U}_j)$ are of the same "type": either an $L(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$-skeleton and an $L(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$-skeleton or an $R(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$-skeleton and an $R(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$-skeleton. Assume for the rest of the proof that $(\gamma_i,\mathcal{U}_i)$ is an $L(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$-skeleton and $(\gamma_j,\mathcal{U}_j)$ is an $L(\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$-skeleton; the argument for the other case is analogous.

By Lemma 12, since $\chi(\mathcal{F}_j) \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{F}_3) > \beta$, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_j$ such that $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > f(n)$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_j(x,y)) > h(2\xi) + 4\xi + 2$ for any two intersecting 1-curves $x, y \in L(\mathcal{H}) \cup R(\mathcal{H})$. Since $\chi(\mathcal{H}) > f(n)$, the family $\mathcal{H}$ contains a chain $((a_1,b_1),\dots,(a_n,b_n))$ of length n. Let x and y be the 1-curves $R(a_n)$ and $L(b_n)$ assigned so that $x \prec y$. By the definition of a chain, x and y intersect, and therefore $\chi(\mathcal{F}_j(x,y)) > h(2\xi) + 4\xi + 2$.

Enumerate the 1-curves in $\mathcal{U}_i$ as $u_1,\dots,u_m$ so that $u_1 \prec \cdots \prec u_m$, where $m = |\mathcal{U}_i|$. Assume $u_1 \prec x \prec y \prec u_m$ for simplicity (adjusting the proof to the general case is straightforward). There are indices ℓ and r with $1 \leqslant \ell < r \leqslant m$, $u_\ell \prec x \prec u_{\ell+1}$, and $u_{r-1} \prec y \prec u_r$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family, the 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}_j$ that intersect u_ℓ have chromatic number at most ξ, and so do those that intersect $u_{\ell+1}$. All other 2-curves $c \in \mathcal{F}_j$ with $x \prec L(c) \prec u_{\ell+1}$ are pairwise disjoint, because their 1-curves $L(c)$ are contained in and $R(c)$ are disjoint from the part of $\operatorname{int}\gamma_i$ between u_ℓ and $u_{\ell+1}$. Thus $\chi(\{c \in \mathcal{F}_j \colon x \prec L(c) \prec u_{\ell+1}\}) \leqslant 2\xi + 1$. Similarly, $\chi(\{c \in \mathcal{F}_j \colon u_{r-1} \prec R(c) \prec y\}) \leqslant 2\xi + 1$. This yields $\ell + 1 \leqslant r - 1$ and $\chi(\mathcal{F}_j(u_{\ell+1}, u_{r-1})) \geqslant \chi(\mathcal{F}_j(x,y)) - 4\xi - 2 > h(2\xi)$.

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a (ξ,h)-family, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_j(u_{\ell+1}, u_{r-1})$ with $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > 2\xi$ such that every 2-curve $c \in \mathcal{F}$ with a basepoint on $I(\mathcal{G})$ satisfies $u_{\ell+1} \prec c \prec u_{r-1}$. Every 2-curve in $\mathcal{G}$ intersecting no 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_j(I(\mathcal{G}))$ must intersect the 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_j$ with rightmost basepoint to the left of $I(\mathcal{G})$ or the 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_j$ with leftmost basepoint to the right of $I(\mathcal{G})$. Therefore, since $\mathcal{F}$ is a ξ-family, the chromatic number of the 2-curves in $\mathcal{G}$ intersecting no 1-curve in $\mathcal{U}_j(I(\mathcal{G}))$ is at most 2ξ. Since $\chi(\mathcal{G}) > 2\xi$, there is at least one 1-curve $u^\star \in \mathcal{U}_j(I(\mathcal{G}))$, which is a subcurve of $L(c^\star)$ for some 2-curve $c^\star \in \mathcal{F}_{j-1}$. Moreover, the basepoint of $L(c^\star)$ lies on $I(\mathcal{G})$, and therefore $u_{\ell+1} \prec c^\star \prec u_{r-1}$. Since $c^\star \in \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_i$ is supported by $(\gamma_i, \mathcal{U}_i)$, the 1-curve $R(c^\star)$ intersects at least one of the 1-curves $u_{\ell+1},\dots,u_{r-1}$, say u_k. Let $a_{n+1} = c^\star$ and b_{n+1} be the 2-curve in $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ such that u_k is a subcurve of $L(b_{n+1})$. For $1 \leqslant t \leqslant n$, the 1-curves $R(a_t)$ and $L(b_t)$ intersect and are both contained in $\operatorname{int}\gamma_j$, the basepoint of $L(a_{n+1})$ is between the basepoints of $R(a_t)$ and $L(b_t)$, and $L(a_{n+1})$ intersects γ_j (as it contains $u^\star$). Therefore, $L(a_{n+1})$ intersects all $R(a_1),\dots,R(a_n)$. We conclude that $((a_1,b_1),\dots,(a_{n+1},b_{n+1}))$ is a chain of length $n+1$. □

Proof of Lemma 15. Let $\zeta = f(2k+1)$, where f is the function claimed by Lemma 19 for ξ and h. Suppose $\chi(\mathcal{F}) > \zeta$. It follows that $\mathcal{F}$ contains a chain of length $2k+1$. This chain contains a subchain $((a_1,b_1),\dots,(a_{k+1},b_{k+1}))$ of pairs of the same "type": $L(a_i)$ intersects $R(a_1),\dots,R(a_{i-1})$ for $2 \leqslant i \leqslant k+1$ and thus $\{a_1,\dots,a_{k+1}\}$ is a clique, or $R(b_i)$ intersects $L(b_1),\dots,L(b_{i-1})$ for $2 \leqslant i \leqslant k+1$ and thus $\{b_1,\dots,b_{k+1}\}$ is a clique. Thus $\omega(\mathcal{F}) > k$. □

3. Proof of Theorem 2

Lemma 20 (Fox, Pach, Suk [9, Lemma 3.2])**.** *For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a constant $\nu_t > 0$ such that every family of curves $\mathcal{F}$ any two of which intersect in at most t points has subfamilies $\mathcal{F}_1,\dots,\mathcal{F}_d \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with the following properties:*

- *for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$, there is a curve $c_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ intersecting all curves in $\mathcal{F}_i \smallsetminus \{c_i\}$,*
- *for $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant d$, every curve in $\mathcal{F}_i$ is disjoint from every curve in $\mathcal{F}_j$,*
- *$|\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_d| \geqslant \nu_t |\mathcal{F}| / \log|\mathcal{F}|$.*

Proof of Theorem 2. The edges of G form a family of curves $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leqslant k-1$ and any two curves in $\mathcal{F}$ intersect in at most t points. Let ν_t, $\mathcal{F}_1,\dots,\mathcal{F}_d$, and $c_1,\dots,c_d$ be as claimed by Lemma 20. For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$, since $\omega(\mathcal{F}_i \smallsetminus \{c_i\}) \leqslant \omega(\mathcal{F}) - 1 \leqslant k-2$, Theorem 1 yields $\chi(\mathcal{F}_i \smallsetminus \{c_i\}) \leqslant f_t(k-2)$. Thus $\chi(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_d) \leqslant f_t(k-2)+1$. For every color class $\mathcal{C}$ in a proper coloring of $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_d$ with $f_t(k-2)+1$ colors, the vertices of G and the curves in $\mathcal{C}$ form a planar topological graph, and thus $|\mathcal{C}| < 3n$. We conclude that $|\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_d| < 3(f_t(k-2)+1)n$ and thus $|\mathcal{F}| < 3\nu_t^{-1}(f_t(k-2)+1)n\log|\mathcal{F}| < 6\nu_t^{-1}(f_t(k-2)+1)n\log n$. □



FIGURE 1. $L(c)$, $R(c)$, $M(c)$ (all the dashed part), and $I(c)$ for a 6-curve c



FIGURE 2. Illustration for Lemma 14: $\mathcal{G} = \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$



FIGURE 3. A skeleton $(\gamma, \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\})$



FIGURE 4. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 19

References

[1] Eyal Ackerman, On the maximum number of edges in topological graphs with no four pairwise crossing edges, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 41 (3), 365–375, 2009.

[2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Boris Aronov, János Pach, Richard Pollack, and Micha Sharir, Quasi-planar graphs have a linear number of edges, *Combinatorica* 17 (1), 1–9, 1997.

[3] Edgar Asplund and Branko Grünbaum, On a colouring problem, *Math. Scand.* 8, 181–188, 1960.

[4] Peter Brass, William Moser, and János Pach, *Research Problems in Discrete Geometry*, Springer, 2005.

[5] James P. Burling, *On coloring problems of families of prototypes*, PhD thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1965.

[6] Maria Chudnovsky, Alex Scott, and Paul Seymour, Induced subgraphs of graphs with large chromatic number. V. Chandeliers and strings, manuscript.

[7] Jacob Fox and János Pach, Coloring K_k-free intersection graphs of geometric objects in the plane, *European J. Combin.* 33 (5), 853–866, 2012.

[8] Jacob Fox and János Pach, Applications of a new separator theorem for string graphs, *Combin. Prob. Comput.* 23 (1), 66–74, 2014.

[9] Jacob Fox, János Pach, and Andrew Suk, The number of edges in k-quasi-planar graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 27 (1), 550–561, 2013.

[10] András Gyárfás, On the chromatic number of multiple interval graphs and overlap graphs, *Discrete Math.* 55 (2), 161–166, 1985. Corrigendum: *Discrete Math.* 62 (3), 333, 1986.

[11] Clemens Hendler, Schranken für Färbungs- und Cliquenüberdeckungszahl geometrisch repräsentierbarer Graphen, Master's thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, 1998.

[12] Alexandr V. Kostochka, On upper bounds for the chromatic numbers of graphs, *Trudy Inst. Mat.* 10, 204–226, 1988, in Russian.

[13] Alexandr V. Kostochka, Coloring intersection graphs of geometric figures with a given clique number, in: János Pach (ed.), *Towards a Theory of Geometric Graphs*, vol. 342 of *Contemp. Math.*, pp. 127–138, AMS, 2004.

[14] Alexandr V. Kostochka and Jan Kratochvíl, Covering and coloring polygon-circle graphs, *Discrete Math.* 163 (1–3), 299–305, 1997.

[15] Tomasz Krawczyk, Arkadiusz Pawlik, and Bartosz Walczak, Coloring triangle-free rectangle overlap graphs with $O(\log \log n)$ colors, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 53 (1), 199–220, 2015.

[16] Tomasz Krawczyk and Bartosz Walczak, On-line approach to off-line coloring problems on graphs with geometric representations, arXiv:1402.2437, to appear in *Combinatorica*.

[17] Michał Lasoń, Piotr Micek, Arkadiusz Pawlik, and Bartosz Walczak, Coloring intersection graphs of arc-connected sets in the plane, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 52 (2), 399–415, 2014.

[18] Jiří Matoušek, Near-optimal separators in string graphs, *Combin. Prob. Comput.* 23 (1), 135–139, 2014.

[19] Sean McGuinness, On bounding the chromatic number of L-graphs, *Discrete Math.* 154 (1–3), 179–187, 1996.

[20] Sean McGuinness, Colouring arcwise connected sets in the plane I, *Graphs Combin.* 16 (4), 429–439, 2000.

[21] Sean McGuinness, Colouring arcwise connected sets in the plane II, *Graphs Combin.* 17 (1), 135–148, 2001.

[22] János Pach, Radoš Radoičić, and Géza Tóth, Relaxing planarity for topological graphs, in: Ervin Győri, Gyula O.H. Katona, and László Lovász (eds.), *More Graphs, Sets and Numbers*, vol. 15 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pp. 285–300, Springer, 2006.

[23] János Pach, Farhad Shahrokhi, and Mario Szegedy, Applications of the crossing number, *Algorithmica* 16 (1), 111–117, 1996.

[24] Arkadiusz Pawlik, Jakub Kozik, Tomasz Krawczyk, Michał Lasoń, Piotr Micek, William T. Trotter, and Bartosz Walczak, Triangle-free geometric intersection graphs with large chromatic number, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 50 (3), 714–726, 2013.

[25] Arkadiusz Pawlik, Jakub Kozik, Tomasz Krawczyk, Michał Lasoń, Piotr Micek, William T. Trotter, and Bartosz Walczak, Triangle-free intersection graphs of line segments with large chromatic number, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 105, 6–10, 2014.

[26] Alexandre Rok and Bartosz Walczak, Outerstring graphs are χ-bounded, in: Siu-Wing Cheng and Olivier Devillers (eds.), *30th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2014)*, pp. 136–143, ACM, 2014.

[27] Andrew Suk, Coloring intersection graphs of x-monotone curves in the plane, *Combinatorica* 34 (4), 487–505, 2014.

[28] Andrew Suk and Bartosz Walczak, New bounds on the maximum number of edges in k-quasi-planar graphs, *Comput. Geom.* 50, 24–33, 2015.

[29] Pavel Valtr, Graph drawing with no k pairwise crossing edges, in: Giuseppe Di Battista (ed.), *5th International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD 1997)*, vol. 1353 of *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.*, pp. 205–218, Springer, 1997.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 12

Proof of Lemma 12. Let $f(\alpha,\beta)=(2\beta+12\xi+20)\alpha$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a ξ-family with $\chi(\mathcal{F})>f(\alpha,\beta)$. Construct a sequence of points $p_0\prec\cdots\prec p_{m+1}$ on the baseline with the following properties:

- the points $p_0,\dots,p_{m+1}$ are distinct from all basepoints of 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$,
- p_0 lies to the left of and p_{m+1} lies to the right of all basepoints of 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$,
- $\chi(\mathcal{F}(p_ip_{i+1}))=\beta+1$ for $0\leqslant i\leqslant m-1$, and $\chi(\mathcal{F}(p_mp_{m+1}))\leqslant\beta+1$.

This is done greedily by first choosing p_1 so that $\chi(\mathcal{F}(p_0p_1))=\beta+1$, then choosing p_2 so that $\chi(\mathcal{F}(p_1p_2))=\beta+1$, and so on.

For $0\leqslant i\leqslant j\leqslant m$, let $\mathcal{F}_{i,j}=\{c\in\mathcal{F}\colon p_i\prec L(c)\prec p_{i+1}$ and $p_j\prec R(c)\prec p_{j+1}\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_{i,i}=\mathcal{F}(p_ip_{i+1})$ for $0\leqslant i\leqslant m$. Since $\mathcal{F}=\bigcup_{0\leqslant i\leqslant j\leqslant m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$, at least one of the following holds:

$$\chi\big(\textstyle\bigcup_{i=0}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,i}\big)>(2\beta+2)\alpha,\quad \chi\big(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1}\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1}\big)>(12\xi+12)\alpha,\quad \chi\big(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-2}\bigcup_{j=i+2}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}\big)>6\alpha.$$

It is enough to find a subfamily $\mathcal{H}\subseteq\mathcal{F}$ with the following property: for any two intersecting 1-curves $x\in R(\mathcal{H})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{H})$, we have $x\in R(\mathcal{F}_{i,j})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{F}_{r,s})$, where $0\leqslant i\leqslant j\leqslant m$, $0\leqslant r\leqslant s\leqslant m$, and $|j-r|\geqslant 2$; then $\chi(\mathcal{F}(x,y))\geqslant\chi(\mathcal{F}(p_{\max(j,r)-1}p_{\max(j,r)}))=\beta+1$, as required.

Suppose $\chi\big(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,i}\big)>(2\beta+2)\alpha$. We have $\chi(\mathcal{F}_{i,i})\leqslant\beta+1$ for $0\leqslant i\leqslant m$. Color the 2-curves in every $\mathcal{F}_{i,i}$ properly using the same set of $\beta+1$ colors on $\mathcal{F}_{i,i}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{r,r}$ whenever $i\equiv r\pmod 2$, thus using $2\beta+2$ colors in total. It follows that $\chi(\mathcal{H})>\alpha$ for some family $\mathcal{H}\subseteq\bigcup_{i=0}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,i}$ of 2-curves of the same color. To conclude, for any two intersecting 1-curves $x\in R(\mathcal{H})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{H})$, we have $x\in R(\mathcal{F}_{i,i})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{F}_{r,r})$ for some distinct indices $i,r\in\{0,\dots,m\}$ with $i\equiv r\pmod 2$ and thus $|i-r|\geqslant 2$.

Now, suppose $\chi\big(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1}\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1}\big)>(12\xi+12)\alpha$. By Lemma 10, we have $\chi(\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1})\leqslant 4\xi+4$ for $0\leqslant i\leqslant m-1$. Color the 2-curves in every $\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1}$ properly using the same set of $4\xi+4$ colors on $\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{r,r+1}$ whenever $i\equiv r\pmod 3$, thus using $12\xi+12$ colors in total. It follows that $\chi(\mathcal{H})>\alpha$ for some family $\mathcal{H}\subseteq\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1}\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1}$ of 2-curves of the same color. To conclude, for any two intersecting 1-curves $x\in R(\mathcal{H})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{H})$, we have $x\in R(\mathcal{F}_{i,i+1})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{F}_{r,r+1})$ for some distinct indices $i,r\in\{0,\dots,m-1\}$ with $i\equiv r\pmod 3$ and thus $|i+1-r|\geqslant 2$.

Finally, suppose $\chi\big(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-2}\bigcup_{j=i+2}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}\big)>6\alpha$. It follows that $\chi\big(\bigcup_{i\in I}\bigcup_{j=i+2}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}\big)>3\alpha$, where $I=\{i\in\{0,\dots,m-2\}\colon i\equiv 0\pmod 2\}$ or $I=\{i\in\{0,\dots,m-2\}\colon i\equiv 1\pmod 2\}$. Consider an auxiliary graph G with vertex set I and edge set $\{ij\colon i,j\in I,\ i<j$, and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}\cup\mathcal{F}_{i,j}\neq\emptyset\}$. Since no two 2-curves in $\mathcal{F}$ cross below the baseline, G has no two edges i_1j_1 and i_2j_2 such that $i_1<i_2<j_1<j_2$. In particular, G is an outerplanar graph, and thus $\chi(G)\leqslant 3$. Fix a proper 3-coloring of G, and use the color of i on every 2-curve in $\bigcup_{j=i+2}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$ for every $i\in I$. It follows that $\chi(\mathcal{H})>\alpha$ for some family $\mathcal{H}\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in I}\bigcup_{j=i+2}^{m}\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$ of 2-curves of the same color. To conclude, for any two intersecting 1-curves $x\in R(\mathcal{H})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{H})$, we have $x\in R(\mathcal{F}_{i,j})$ and $y\in L(\mathcal{F}_{r,s})$ for some indices $i,r\in I$, $j\in\{i+2,\dots,m\}$, and $s\in\{r+2,\dots,m\}$ such that $j\notin\{r-1,r\}$ (otherwise ir would be an edge of G), $j\neq r+1$ (otherwise two 2-curves, one from $\mathcal{F}_{i,r+1}$ and one from $\mathcal{F}_{r,s}$, would cross below the baseline), and thus $|j-r|\geqslant 2$. □

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 6

Proof of Theorem 6. A *probe* is a section of H^+ bounded by two vertical rays starting at the baseline. We use induction to construct, for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, an LR-family $\mathcal{X}_k$ of double-curves and a family $\mathcal{P}_k$ of pairwise disjoint probes with the following properties:

(1) every probe in $\mathcal{P}_k$ is disjoint from $L(X)$ for every double-curve $X\in\mathcal{X}_k$,
(2) for every probe $P\in\mathcal{P}_k$, the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}_k$ intersecting P are pairwise disjoint,
(3) $\mathcal{X}_k$ is triangle-free, that is, $\omega(\mathcal{X}_k)\leqslant 2$,

(4) for every proper coloring of $\mathcal{X}_k$, there is a probe $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that at least k distinct colors are used on the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}_k$ intersecting P.

This is enough for the proof of theorem, because the last property implies $\chi(\mathcal{X}_k) \geqslant k$. For a pair $(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ satisfying the conditions above and a probe $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$, let $\mathcal{X}_k(P)$ denote the set of double-curves in $\mathcal{X}_k$ intersecting P.

The base case $k = 1$ is easy: we let $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{X\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{P\}$, where X and P look as follows:



It is clear that the conditions (1)–(4) are satisfied.

For the induction step, we assume $k \geqslant 1$ and construct the pair $(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}, \mathcal{P}_{k+1})$ from $(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P})$ be a copy of $(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$. For every probe $P \in \mathcal{P}$, put another copy $(\mathcal{X}^P, \mathcal{P}^P)$ of $(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ entirely inside P. Then, for every probe $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and every probe $Q \in \mathcal{P}^P$, let a double-curve X_Q^P and probes A_Q^P and B_Q^P look as follows:



In particular, X_Q^P intersects the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}^P(Q)$, A_Q^P intersects the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}(P) \cup \mathcal{X}^P(Q)$, and B_Q^P intersects the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}(P) \cup \{X_Q^P\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{X}_{k+1} = \mathcal{X} \cup \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{X}^P \cup \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \{X_Q^P \colon Q \in \mathcal{P}^P\}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{k+1} = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \{A_Q^P, B_Q^P \colon Q \in \mathcal{P}^P\}.$$

The conditions (1) and (2) clearly hold for $(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}, \mathcal{P}_{k+1})$, and (2) for $(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ implies (3) for $(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}, \mathcal{P}_{k+1})$. To see that (4) holds for $(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}, \mathcal{P}_{k+1})$ and $k+1$, consider a proper coloring ϕ of $\mathcal{X}_{k+1}$. Let $\phi(X)$ denote the color of a double-curve $X \in \mathcal{X}_{k+1}$ and $\phi(\mathcal{Y})$ denote the set of colors used on a subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{k+1}$. By (4) applied to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P})$, there is a probe $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $|\phi(\mathcal{X}(P))| \geqslant k$. By (4) applied to $(\mathcal{X}^P, \mathcal{P}^P)$, there is a probe $Q \in \mathcal{P}^P$ such that $|\phi(\mathcal{X}^P(Q))| \geqslant k$. Since X_Q^P intersects the double-curves in $\mathcal{X}^P(Q)$, we have $\phi(X_Q^P) \notin \phi(\mathcal{X}^P(Q))$. If $\phi(\mathcal{X}(P)) \neq \phi(\mathcal{X}^P(Q))$, then $\mathcal{X}_{k+1}(A_Q^P) = \mathcal{X}(P) \cup \mathcal{X}^P(Q)$ yields $|\phi(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}(A_Q^P))| = |\phi(\mathcal{X}(P)) \cup \phi(\mathcal{X}^P(Q))| \geqslant k+1$. If $\phi(\mathcal{X}(P)) = \phi(\mathcal{X}^P(Q))$, then $\mathcal{X}_{k+1}(B_Q^P) = \mathcal{X}(P) \cup \{X_Q^P\}$ and $\phi(X_Q^P) \notin \phi(\mathcal{X}(P))$ yield $|\phi(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}(B_Q^P))| = |\phi(\mathcal{X}(P)) + 1| \geqslant k+1$. This shows that (4) holds for $(\mathcal{X}_{k+1}, \mathcal{P}_{k+1})$ and $k+1$. $\square$